

## REMARKS

The following remarks are provided in response to the Office Action mailed May 9, 2007 in which the office action:

- rejected claims 1-2, 4-10, 12-18 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable by US patent 7,134,138 to Scherr (hereinafter Scherr) and further in view of US patent 7,194,762 to Challener et al. (hereinafter Challener).

The applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the above referenced patent application for the following reasons:

### Claims 1-2, 4-10, 12-18 and 20 rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-2, 4-10, 12-18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable by Scherr in view of Challener. The Applicants herein amend independent claims 1, 9 and 17, from which claims 2, 4-8, 10, 12-16, 18 and 20 depend, and respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider claims 1-2, 4-10, 12-18 and 20 in view of the amendments and the following arguments.

The Applicants herein amend independent claims 1 and 9 to include the element, *“communicating the delegate owner token, **but not the master owner token**, to the delegated environment.”* (See specification p. 6, lines 24-26; p. 7, line 23 – p. 8, line 16.) Independent claim 17 recites a similar limitation. Scherr fails to disclose communicating a delegate owner token, but not a master owner token, to a delegated environment. In fact, Scherr teaches away from communicating a delegate owner token, but not a master owner token, to a delegated environment because Scherr discloses providing a master

token **42** to a delegated environment (host **22**). (See Scherr Col. 8, lines 34-49.)

The office action relies on Challenger merely to disclose a server comprising a security chip, such as a Trusted Platform Module. (See Examiner's response dated May 9, 2007 p. 3, last paragraph – p. 4, first paragraph.) As such, Challenger fails to cure the above-noted deficiencies of Scherr. Thus, **neither Scherr nor Challenger, alone or in combination, disclose communicating a delegate owner token, but not a master owner token, to a delegated environment**, as taught and claimed by the Applicants.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection to claims 1-2, 4-10, 12-18 and 20.

### CONCLUSION

The applicants submit that they have overcome the Examiner's rejections of the claims and that they have the right to claim the invention as set forth in the listed claims. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a)(3), applicant(s) hereby request and authorize the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office to (1) treat any concurrent or future reply that requires a petition for extension of time as incorporating a petition for extension of time for the appropriate length of time and (2) charge all required fees, including extension of time fees and fees under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 and 1.17, to Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, L.L.P.

September 12, 2007

Date

/Gregory D. Caldwell/

Gregory D. Caldwell, Reg. #39,926

1279 Oakmead Parkway  
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040  
Telephone: (503) 439-8778  
Facsimile: (503) 439-6073